



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/821,073	04/08/2004	Aurobinda Pradhan	13906-191001 / 2003P00966	9212
32864	7590	04/17/2006	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			SAIN, GAUTAM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
DATE MAILED: 04/17/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center"><b>Office Action Summary</b></p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">10/821,073</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">PRADHAN, AUROBINDA</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Gautam Sain</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2176</p>	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 May 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                         |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/8/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

**DETAILED ACTION**

- 1) This is a Nonfinal rejection in response to application filed on 4/8/04
- 2) Claims 1-20 are pending and rejected below.
- 3) Effective filing date 4/8/04.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

- 4) The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 4-1) Claims 1, 2, 6, 7-10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (US 6313855, issued Nov 6, 2001).**

**Regarding claims 1, 12, and 14,** Shuping teaches displaying a view of a selected electronic document on a graphical user interface. For example, in a method for web browsing, a user selects a web page and it is rendered on the browser as a current page (see Fig 4, items 410, 450).

Shuping does not expressly teach displaying on the graphical user interface, ... a user selectable command ... on the graphical user interface. But one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have thought it would have been obvious based on Shuping's disclosure. Shuping discloses, in the method for web browsing, while the current page is displayed, the user selecting the "backward" navigation button on the tool bar of the browser, which navigates user through the past history of the web page.

Art Unit: 2176

The past pages and current pages are associated by the history of the browser (col 1, lines 60-63).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a backward navigation button on the tool bar of the browser which allowed for navigation to pages prior the current page as taught by Shuping, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

**Regarding claims 2 and 15**, Shuping teaches the user-selectable command ... toolbar of the graphical user interface. For example, the "backward" button on a tool bar (col 1, lines 60-61).

**Regarding claims 6 and 18**, Shuping does not expressly teach the electronic documents forming a hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a

Art Unit: 2176

current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment

(Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

**Regarding claims 7 and 19**, Shuping does not expressly teach association categories provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the past web page is a parent and the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the past web page is equivalent to going to a parent page or one upward (or prior) in time. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

**Regarding claims 8 and 20**, Shuping does not expressly teach association categories provides navigation upward in the hierarchy, but one would interpret Shuping disclosure as rendering it obvious. Shuping discloses past, current and future web pages (col 2, lines 15-25). By applying the broadest reasonable interpretation, the examiner interprets the past, current and future as a hierarchy arranged in a temporal progression where the future web page is a child of the current web page. And going to the future

Art Unit: 2176

web page is equivalent to going to a child page or one down (or future) in time. This has the same logical relationship as a tree structure because the links can be and arranged and traversed like a tree structure.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to interpret a past, current and future web page as taught by Shuping as equivalent of a hierarchy, providing the benefit of having web browsers that display a current web page along with past web pages in a unique browsing environment (Shuping, col 1, lines 7-10).

**Regarding claims 9 and 13**, Shuping teaches receiving a predetermined ... command. For example, the "backwards" button is a command on the tool bar which is existing before and provides user with functionality (col 1, lines 59-63).

Shuping teaches in response to receiving ... one other electronic document. For example, upon user selecting the "backwards" command, displaying the past web pages prior to the current page (col 1, lines 59-63)

**Regarding claim 10**, Shuping teaches ceasing to display ... other electronic document. For example, in a conventional browser, upon the user selecting the "backward" button, the conventional browser stops displaying the "current" web page and moves on to display the immediately previous web page (col 2, lines 15-22).

**4-2) Claims 3, 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (as cited above), in view of Patil et al (US 6489975, issued Dec 3, 2002).**

**Regarding claims 3 and 16**, Shuping does not expressly teach the selected document is associated ... plurality of user-selectable commands for displaying ... documents.

But Patil does teach it. For example, the Bar (item 40) shows the backward button (item 46) and forward button (item 48). That show past and future pages (Patil, see Fig 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shuping to include a tool bar multiple commands as shown in Patil, with the motivation to combine because Shuping teaches navigation buttons on a tool bar of conventional web browsers (Shuping, col 1, lines 60-62).

**Regarding claim 11**, Shuping does not expressly teach displaying another user-selectable command ... graphical user interface. But Patil does teach it. For example, the refresh button (item 52) causes the current page to be displayed with more recent data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Shuping to include a tool bar multiple commands and one command for refreshing the current page displayed as shown in Patil, with the motivation to combine because Shuping teaches navigation buttons on a tool bar of conventional web browsers (Shuping, col 1, lines 60-62).

**4-3) Claims 4, 5, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shuping et al (as cited above), in view of Patil et al (as cited above), further in view of Pirolli et al (US 5895470, issued Apr 1999).**

**Claim 4**, Shuping in view of Patil does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests associations between ... categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents

Art Unit: 2176

in a linked collection of documents where the system obtains the topology and usage information for documents in order to classify/categorize (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Patil to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

**Claim 5**, Shuping in view of Patil does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests associations between ... categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Patil to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

**Claim 17**, Shuping in view of Patil does not expressly teach, but Pirolli suggests associations between ... categories. For example, a system for categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents where the system obtains the topology and usage information for documents in order to classify/categorize (Pirolli, Abstract section, col 5, lines 30-35).



It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of the invention to modify Shuping in view of Patil to include categorizing documents in a linked collection of documents as taught by Pirolli, providing the benefit of enabling a user to more efficiently traversing through the collection of linked documents (Pirolli, Abstract section).

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gautam Sain whose telephone number is 571-272-4096. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G.S. 4/11/06  
GS

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100